



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/538,954

01/19/2006

Sun-Wing Tong

5321-4PUS

5616

27799

7590

04/04/2008

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
551 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1210
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER

WOOD, AMANDA P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1657

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,954	Applicant(s) TONG ET AL.	
	Examiner AMANDA P. WOOD	Art Unit 1657	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-11 are presented for consideration on the merits.

Priority

Applicant's claim for benefit to priority for 371 of PCT/IB03/06203, filed on 12/24/2003, which claims benefit of US Provisional Application 60/436,496, filed on 12/26/2002, is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 14 June 2005 has been received and entered. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The drawings filed on 14 June 2005 have been received and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, Applicant recites “at least partially dried vaginal discharge” in line 12 of claim 1. Applicant does not provide an adequate explanation of what encompasses “at least partially” in the specification so as to convey to one of skill in the art how to practice the claimed invention.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 6, Applicant recites the phrase “identifying high-risk, intermediate-risk, and low-risk human papillomavirus.” Applicant does not describe any of these three types of HPV in the instant specification adequately to convey what would encompass each type of HPV, and how the different HPV’s are characterized.

Claims 1-3, 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of testing for the presence of human papillomavirus, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of testing for the presence of all infectious disease agents. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The court in *Wands* states: “Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is ‘undue,’ not ‘experimentation.’ ” (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. “Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations.” (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the breadth of the claims, (2) the nature of the invention, (3) the state of the prior art, (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, (5) the relative skill of those in the art, (6) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (7) the presence or absence of working examples, and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

N.B. MPEP 2164.04 states, “[w]hile the analysis and conclusion of a lack of enablement are based on the factors discussed in MPEP § 2164.01(a) and the evidence as a whole, it is not necessary to discuss each factor in the written enablement rejection” and that “[t]he language should focus on those factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, or that the scope of any enablement provided to one skilled in the art is not commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims.” Accordingly, the Factors most relevant to the instant rejection are addressed in detail below.

1-2 .Breadth of the claims and the nature of the invention..

In regard to the method of the invention and the breadth of the claims the broadest interpretation that applies is a method of testing for the presence of infectious disease agents comprising applying a device comprising an absorbent and porous material to collect vaginal discharge, and determining the presence of infectious disease agents in the partially dried vaginal discharge.

3-4. The state of prior art and the level of predictability in the art.

Caillouette (US 6,117,090) teaches that pathogenic bacteria in the vagina can be detected using a swab device which is contacted with vaginal moisture and has a reactant that changes color when contacted by moisture containing pathogenic bacteria (see, for example, claim 29). Furthermore, Lawrence et al (US 5,571,684) teach that bacterial vaginosis cannot be attributed to one specific etiologic agent, although it results from a drastic alteration in the vaginal flora, and is associated with placental infection, premature delivery, and low birth weight babies (see, for example, col. 1-2).

5. The relative skill in the art.

The relative skill in the art as it relates to the method of the invention is characterized by that of a M.D. or Ph. D. level individual.

6-7. The amount of guidance present and the existence of working examples.

Applicant only provides working examples for determining the presence of HPV in vaginal fluid, and no guidance for any infectious diseases beyond HPV.

8. The quantity of experimentation necessary.

The amount of experimentation that is required is undue: while detecting HPV in vaginal fluid is routine, a method of detecting any number of infectious disease agents in vaginal fluid is not routine and requires more experimentation. Based upon the teaching of Caillouette and Lawrence et al with respect to the vast array of infectious diseases that cause problems in the vagina, and the lack of guidance provided by Applicant with respect to detecting any other infectious diseases in vaginal fluid, it would take considerable experimentation to implement the methods provided by Applicant toward detecting other infectious diseases.

Therefore, in view of the overly broad scope of the claims, the lack of guidance and working examples provided in the specification, and the high degree of unpredictability as evidenced by the prior art, undue experimentation would be necessary for a skilled artisan to make and use the entire scope of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

No claims allowed

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMANDA P. WOOD whose telephone number is (571)272-8141. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber can be reached on (571) 272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

APW
Examiner
Art Unit 1657

/Christopher R. Tate/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655